



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. FLECKEISEN u. MASIUS.
1881.

V.

44. Pp. 289-305. O. Crusius of Dresden reviews Tümpel's Ares und Aphrodite (Jahrbücher, Supplementband, 1880). Of late it has been assumed that the connection of these divinities was merely the result of poetic caprice. Tümpel follows a hint from Overbeck and maintains the true national and religious significance of the union, devoting to the long-neglected problem a searching investigation which is thought to have settled the main points of the question. Neither in ancient poetry nor in any work of art of the best period is there any hint of a connection between Ares and the armed Uranian Aphrodite. It is conjectured that the original companion of Ares was one of the Greek goddesses who guarded the citadel of Boeotian Thebes; and that she, changed to Aphrodite under Semitic influence, gave occasion for the union of Ares and Aphrodite. Demeter, Athena, Erinys, who had a common altar at Thebes, are identified by T. with the trinity of Aphrodites of the Cadmean citadel—Urania, Pandemus, Apostrophia (introduced in Rome as Venus *Verticordia*). The name *Urania* may have given the first impulse to the assignment of different moral characters to the three forms. The identity of the Erinys (corresponding to the Athenian Enyo) with Aphrodite Apostrophia is thought to be established by Tümpel, who assigns her as mate to Ares, as Demeter-Aphrodite had been convincingly assigned to Hermes by H. D. Müller. This Aonian couple of Ares and Erinys was the original of Ares and Aphrodite. The Gordian knot of the descent of Ares is cut by T. who recognizes him as a primitive Greek god, and insists that the belief in the god's Thracian origin arose from the warlike nature of the Thracians.

The essay is considered a valuable contribution to the history of Greek religions. It illustrates well Müller's law, that the divinities of the Greek people were generally united in pairs or groups.

45. Pp. 305-307. A. Schultz of Hirschberg, *à propos* of Roscher's die Gorgonen, etc., interprets the story of Melanippus and Comaetho ("fiery locks"), Paus. VII 19. The one is the dark thundercloud, the other the gleaming lightning. Their love is only a different form of the story of Poseidon's love for Medusa.

46. Pp. 308-309. R. Schneider of Duisburg, from MS lexicon (of Moschopolus?) of the XIVth century, in the Munich library, communicates a page of extracts which are interesting for their citations from the Greek poets.

47. Pp. 309-310. R. Löhhbach of Mayence (see Am. Journ. Phil. I 376) returns to "der goldene Schnitt" of the hexameter, iambic trimeter, Sapphic verse, etc. As the iambic trimeter consists of 18 *morae*, of which 7 precede and

11 follow the penthemimeral (the most usual) caesura, we have the proportion 18:11::11:7. In the hexameter we have to assume that the caesural pause occupies two *morae*. Then the verse consists of 26 *morae*, of which 16 (counting the pause) precede the hephthemimeral caesura and 10 follow it. Then 26:16::16:10 (approximately). A hexameter verse with trithemimeral, penthemimeral, and hephthemimeral pauses will have divisions of 6, 4, 6, 10 *morae*. Then 16:10::10:6; 10:6::6:4.

48. Pp. 311-320. F. Kiel of Hannover treats of the truce of 423 B. C., Thuc. IV 118. The document is divided into four parts. The first concerns the use of the temple and oracle at Delphi, and was prepared at Athens as is shown by the present *δοκεῖ* distinguished from the *έδοξε* of §4. The second article, concerning the punishment of temple robbers, was added at the wish of the Athenians, but probably had been discussed in Sparta. The third and fourth articles, beginning *τάδε έδοξε κτλ.*, concerning the line of demarcation between the two parties during the truce, and arranging for possible changes in the conditions and for the continuance of the truce—these articles had been voted in Sparta in the form in which Thucydides gives them. The Phocians took no part in the truce because they disliked the interference of the first articles with their state. The Boeotians perhaps did not want a truce and may have objected to the second article.

49. P. 320. H. Schütz of Potsdam proposes four emendations to the Histories of Tacitus.

50. Pp. 321-326. E. Rohde of Tübingen on the date of the composition of the Theaetetus of Plato. He refers the "25 ancestors leading to Heracles," Theaet. 175 a, to either Agesilaus of Sparta or Philip of Macedon, who are shown by their genealogical trees to be of that degree of descent from Heracles. Philip seems to have received his first "encomium" from Isocrates, and though the Xenophontine Agesilaus (beginning *τοῖς προγόνους . . . πόστος άφ' Ηρακλέους έγένετο*) might well be hit by Plato's words, the Evagoras of Isocrates (not earlier than 374 B. C.) was the first prose encomium on a contemporary. If encomia on Agesilaus († 361-360 B. C.) are referred to by the Theaet., then this dialogue was composed after that time, but surely it was written after 374 B. C. Plato is not hitting Isocrates but the Encomiasts who followed Isocrates. But the Theaetetus was earlier than the Sophistes and Politicus and also the Philebus. The later composition of the Philebus is shown by the concession without argument of the *δόξαι ψευδεῖς*, 36 cd, which presupposes the argument of the Theaetetus, as the rapid conclusions of the Phaedo concerning the *ανάμνησις* of the act of learning are a distinct indication of the earlier composition of the Meno, where this argument is stated in full.

51. P. 326. H. Schütz of Potsdam proposes three emendations to Tacitus's Dialogus de Oratoribus; reading in §18 *nulla a parte*, and removing *magis* or *prae* from *qui prae Catone*, etc. in the same §. In §36 for *saperet* he would read *caperet*.

52. Pp. 327-335. E. Ziegeler of Bremen criticises Bernays' Lucian und die Kyniker, Berlin, 1879. Bernays idealized the *κνισμός*, and thus could hardly be a fair judge of Lucian, the zealous opponent of the cynics. This sentiment seems to lead Bernays to believe the Demonax not a work of Lucian. His

other arguments for this view are not convincing. Ziegeler still holds that Demonax was a historical personage, and considers the Demonax a genuine work of Lucian.

53. Pp. 335-336. T. Büttner-Wobst of Dresden would remove ὅσαι τ' αὖ μωαρχίαι from the text of Xenophon, *Cyrop.* I 1, §1. After the mention of the fall of the democracy we expect in an Athenian writer to find the oligarchy which took the place of the democracy in Athens. The succession 'democracy, monarchy, oligarchy, tyranny,' is strange; and μωαρχία is seldom used by Xenophon (we expect βασιλεία, cf. *Mem.* IV 6, §12, and *Ages.* I 4).

54. Pp. 337-356. Realistic notes on Horace, by O. Jäger of Cologne. Although Horace is the most popular of all ancient poets, next to Homer, so much has been read and written about him that it is hard to find our way to the poet himself, through what is external. The critical superstition that he cannot have written anything in bad taste or style also interferes with our judgment. These notes are intended to lead us to receive the impression which was made upon the first readers or hearers of the poems. In *Sat.* II 3, 305-326 in the rehearsal of the poet's faults, he is accused in a comic way of the very opposite of his real faults. *Car.* III 3 finds its explanation and true value when it is taken as a reference to a supposed desire of Augustus to remove the seat of the Roman empire to Alexandria or Troy. In general, Jäger thinks Horace a shrewd politician. The *sermones deorum* of *Car.* III 3, 71, are explained by *Sat.* II 6, 40 fg., and by the *deos* of v. 52. The inconsistencies of *Car.* III 27 are explained as arising from the poet's inability to resist the temptation to give a poetical picture of Europa. The Marsyas statue of *Sat.* I 6, 120 is shown by a relief found in Rome in Sept. '72, which agrees with some old coins, to be a Silenus with the wine-skin, but the connection shows that it was a rude old statue with the face contorted as if he had been flayed.

55. Pp. 357-360. Critical notes by K. Rossberg of Norden to the *Aegritudo Perdicae*, published by Bährens in his *Unedited Latin Poems* (1877).

56. Pp. 361-364. Fr. Rühl of Königsberg on Alexander and his physician Philip. The various sources are examined, and it is shown that the story of Alexander's sickness, as caused by a bath in the Cydnus, and the incident of the physician, is a myth. The letter warning the king against his physician could not have come from Parmenio or Olympia.

57. Pp. 364-365. Carl Jacoby of Danzig urges the reading which Bentley proposed, *sic di voluere*, for *Hor. Car.* I 12, 31.

VI.

59. Pp. 369-380. Review by J. Renner of Littau of Homers *Iliade* erklärt von Faesi; sechste Auflage von Franke, I-II, 1879-80. The editor's work is highly commended and a number of occasional remarks are made upon passages in books A-M.

60. Pp. 380-382. J. Sitzler of Tauberbischofsheim discusses τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν κτλ., *Hom. a* 170. He considers this equivalent to τίς τίνος ἐσσί of *Simonides*, *Ep.* 154, and supports his view, among other arguments, by *Hom. Hy. Dem.* 113 τίς πόθεν ἐσσί, γρηῖν, παλαιγενέων ἀνθρώπων, which can hardly be 'from

what nation of ancient men art thou'; and by Hom. Φ 150, where after *τίς πόθεν εἰς κτλ.* follows the answer *τίη γενεῇν ἑρεῖνεις*. Thus the question concerns the *γενεή*, not the *πατρίς*. [We may compare also *τὸν ὁμόθεν* of Eur. Orestes 486.]

61. Pp. 383-384. H. Eichler of Frankfort an der Oder, in Plato's *Laches* 196 *d* would strike out *πᾶσα* before *ὕς*.

62. Pp. 385-391. R. Gropius of Weilburg praises Pulch *de Eudociae quod fertur Violario*. G. had himself cherished and sent to the *Jahrbücher* for publication views which were preoccupied by Pulch. It is shown that the *Violarium* was a literary fraud of the XVIth century. The basis of the work is the edition of Phavorinus published at Basle in 1538, and of Cornutus and Palaephatus, 1543. Gropius adds various comments to his statement of Pulch's views. [Pulch shows in *Hermes* XVII 177 fg. that the author of the *Violarium* was a clerk of the Library at Paris named Palaeocappa.]

63. Pp. 391-392. Beloch of Rome would read *Ἰπωνέας καὶ Μεδμαίους* for *Ἰτωνέας καὶ Μελαίους* in Thuc. V 5, 3.

64. P. 392. R. Dressler of Bautzen would read in Stobaeus, Anthol. XLVI 67 *αὐτὸς καταδικάζων κλαίεις* for *καταδικάζεις καὶ κλαίεις*.

65. Pp. 393-398. E. Rosenberg of Hirschberg calls attention to many Homeric reminiscences, especially in adjectives, in the poems of Horace.

66. Pp. 398-400. P. Stengel of Berlin on *Ἡρακλῆς Μήλων*. He thinks the name was given to the hero first as protector of the flocks, and that the name afterwards brought him sacrifices of fruits. Stengel enumerates examples of offerings of *figures* of animals instead of the animals themselves.

67. Pp. 401-416. Baehrens of Groningen on Latin poets. The slave-name *Afer* which the poet Terence retained after his manumission, shows that he was known only as an African by birth. If anything had been known of the later story of his Carthaginian birth, he would have been *Poenus* or *Poenulus*. Baehrens offers emendations to Suetonius' life of Terence and to the *Andria*; then to Lucretius, Ovid and the Latin Anthology.

68. P. 416. G. Landgraf of Schweinfurt collects instances of *sic = tum, deinde*.

69. Pp. 417-420. Th. Plüss of Basle energetically maintains, against Lange, his view of the *sex suffragia*, that they were a later grouping of the 12 *centuriae*, each pair of *centuriae* having one vote.

70. Pp. 421-422. G. Heidtmann of Wesel conjectures *bis senis* for *bi denis*, Verg. Aen. I 381 (giving Aeneas the same number of ships as Ulysses); *facilem rectu* for *facilem victu*, I 445. In I 505, *media testudine* is explained as the middle of the *breadth*, not of the *length* of the temple roof. The temple had a vaulted roof, not a dome.

71. Pp. 423-425. A. Viertel of Königsberg shows the correctness of the old tradition that the MS of Tacitus' *Annals* came from Corvey to Italy not long before 1509, into the hands of Giovanni de' Medici, afterwards Leo X.

72. Pp. 426-428. Rohde of Tübingen gives a page from a rhetorical *ἀνέκδοτον* of the Brussels library, a commentary to Cicero *de inventione*.

73. Pp. 429-431. Rönsch of Lobenstein discusses the Latin adjectives in *-stus* and *-utus*.

74. Pp. 431-432. Dombart of Erlangen offers two emendations to Paulinus of Nola.

75. P. 432. E. Klussman in the Genethliacus of Claudius Mamertinus would read (c. 3, s. 104, 1 Baehrens) for *Herculistus*, *Hercules iste tuus*.

VII.

(23.) Pp. 433-448. Christ of Munich continues his remarks on interpolations in Homer (see Am. Jour. Phil. III 261). How is the agreement between the Homeric and the Cyclic poems to be accounted for? Did the Cyclic poets follow the Homeric poems and the older lays of the Trojan cycle, or are the passages which seem to indicate this to be explained as later interpolations in the Homeric poems? Christ first takes up the clear case of Hom. δ 280 fg. (of the experiences in the wooden horse) where 280-284 give the old form of the story with the names of the ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν, Menelaus, Diomed, and Ulysses; in 285-289 follows the later form of the story as it was developed by the cyclic poets. So the passage δ 247-249 is ascribed to a desire for harmony with the Little Iliad, and δέκτην, v. 248, is to be written Δέκτην as it was in the cyclic poets. Of the dittography λ 441-456, Christ agrees with Nauck, etc., in considering 444-453 the interpolated part, calling attention to the fact that it is not enough to remove 454-456, since 444 fg. do not harmonize well with 441 fg. Γ 144 Αἰθέρη Περσέως θυγάτηρ κτλ. was inserted under the influence of the Iliupersis and Little Iliad, in which without regard to chronological difficulties the Theseus legends were brought into connection with Troy. So Ω 29-30 (the judgment of Paris) are referred to an interpolator who brought into our text a reminiscence from the Cypria of Stasinus. C. also separates lines and passages which he believes to have come in under the influence of Hesiod or the Argonautic myths, as κ 137-139, μ 69-72 and 61-65; also μ 3-4, since not the Ulyssean but the Argonautic story had to do with the far East.

These are interpolations, but it is remarked that the verses in our text of Homer which presuppose well-developed myths of Heracles, Tlepolemus Meleager, Melampus, Theseus, are found only in the later parts of the Iliad and Odyssey.

76. P. 448. J. Golisch of Schweidnitz illustrates ἴν' αὐτοῦ, Soph. Trach. 145, by ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ, Soph. O. T. 78; αὐτοῦ ἔκει, Thuc. VII 16, 1; αὐτοῦ κ' ἐνθά, Θ 20; ἐνθάδε κ' αὐθι, ε 208.

77. Pp. 449-480. E. Hiller of Halle reviews Theognidis elegiae recog. Ziegler, 1880; and Theognidis reliquiae ed. Sitzler, 1880, and discusses many of the questions relating to the poet and his works which are thus introduced. Ziegler's edition is pronounced indispensable to any student of Theognis, while Sitzler's work is severely criticised.

78. Pp. 481-493. E. Petersen of Prague notices with high praise R. Schneider's die Geburt von Athena and J. Dürr's die Reisen des Kaiser's Hadrian, Abhandlungen des Arch-Ep. Seminars, Vienna, 1880-81.

79. Pp. 493-494. C. Lang of Offenburg offers conjectures to the text of Cornutus.

80. Pp. 495-496. A. Procksch of Eisenberg gives statistics concerning the position of *quisque* and *uterque* in Cicero (see Am. Jour. Philol. II 268, 533).

81. Pp. 497-507. C. Gneisse of Metz discusses Lucretius's use of *porro*, including questions of text criticism and exegesis.

82. Pp. 508-510. G. P. Weygoldt of Lörrach shows that the statement of the pseudo Plutarch that Diogenes considered the heart the seat of the soul, refers to the Stoic, and not, as has generally been understood, to Diogenes Apolloniates.

83. Pp. 511-512. Georges of Gotha presents a lexicographical and critical miscellany to Latin authors.

84. P. 512. O. Weise in Pliny Nat. Hist. XXI 111 would read *oiston* (διστόν) for *pistana*.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE. Vol. VI.

No. 2. April.

1. Pp. 112-148. Criticism of Greek texts at the *École des Hautes Études*. I. Sophocles: 154 emendations, submitted by "Y." These emendations may be classified into certain, probable, plausible, improbable, impossible. In the last two classes are found some that are entirely unnecessary. Without attempting to assign each to its class, I shall call attention to a few that are, from whatever cause, especially striking. In Ai. 523, γένοιτ' ἔθ' ¹ and Wecklein's conjecture πέλοιτ' ἔθ' or πέλοι πόθ' are condemned because "one can neither become nor cease to be *well born*" (*bien né, eugénēs*), and the tame οὐκ ἂν λέγοιτ' ἔθ' is proposed. Here it is assumed that *eugénēs* is always used in a literal sense, which is by no means the case; for while Aristotle teaches expressly that the difference between *γενναῖος* and *eugénēs* is that the former *always* implies nobility of character as well as birth, *eugénēs* certainly sometimes refers especially to character. The Lexica cite Antig. 38-9, Philoct. 8, 74, etc. In Eur. Frag. 345 and 514 we have a play upon the one meaning in *eugéneia* and the other meaning in *eugénēs*. Besides, even if this were not the case, the emendation would not be satisfactory. People could have no objection to calling one *eugénēs* in a literal sense whatever he might do, πολλοὶ γὰρ ὄντες *eugeneis* εἰσιν κακοί (Eur. Elect. 551). (2.) In Elect. 532-3, the double pleonasm is removed by writing οὐκ ἴσον καμῶν, ἐμοὶ | λύπας ὅτ' ἔσπειρ', ὥσπερ ἡ τίκτοισ' ἐγώ. (3.) In Elect. 548, δ' is changed to τ' because "in δοκῶ μὲν the particle never corresponds to a following δέ." If this dogma is true the Greeks certainly could not be misled by δέ *copulative* following, as there was no danger of ambiguity. (4.) In Elect. 947, ἦ is changed to ὁ τι because "ἦ denotes the means," and the general sense does not call for this. It seems rather to denote the manner: 'how I shall act'; and this is about the same as 'what I shall do,' so

¹ Γενεσθαι means 'manifestation' as well as 'becoming.' Hdt. 8, 86: ἥσαν γε καὶ ἐγένοντο ταῦτην τὴν ἡμέρην μακρῇ ἀμένοντες αὐτοὶ ἐωντῶν, where Krüger ἐγένοντο *bewiesen sich durch die That*.

that no change is necessary. (5.) Elect. 1139, λουτροῖς σ' ἐκόσμησ': σ' not in the Laurent. if in any MS at all. Read λουτρῶ σ' (i. e. ΛΟΥΤΡΟΙΣ of the earliest MSS). (6.) Oed. R. 422, after the removal of λιμήν from 420 it is proposed to read: *ὃν λιμέν'* at verse-end instead of *ὃν δόμοις*, with the remark that the elision is but one more example of the *εἶδος Σοφόκληιον*. But any one introducing into the text such an elision is expected at least to allude to the question whether the last syllable must not be long. (7.) Oed. R. 586: read *ἀτρεστον εὔδειν*. (8.) Oed. R. 977: for *ὦ* (Meineke *οἷς*, Blaydes *οὐ*) read *ὦν*. (9.) Oed. C. 45: for *γῆς* it is proposed to read *γ' ἐκ*, and a very unnecessary apology offered for leaving the verse "without caesura." In fact it has three, any one of which would suffice according to Sophoclean usage. (10.) Oed. C. 1027: for *κτήματ'* read *'κτημέν'*. (11.) Trach. 159: for *οὐπω* (Laurent. *οὐπω*) read *οὐτω*. (12.) Trach. 345: for *χῶ λόγος σημαίνεται* is proposed *χῶ λόγος σὸς βαίνεται* with the remark that *λόγος σοι βαίνεται* would violate the Porsonic law. But even *λόγος σὸς βαίνεται* has so few parallels that it is to be avoided,¹ as being improbable, in making emendations. (13.) Trach. 1062: read *κάνανδρος*. (14.) Philoct. 76: *ὥστ' εἰ με τόξων ἐγκρατὴς αἰσθήσεται*, | *δλωλα καὶ σὲ προσδιαφθερῶ ξυνόν*. "Le futur *προσδιαφθερῶ* ne va pas à côté du parfait à sens présent (!) *δλωλα*. Il faut certainement (!) rétablir le présent *προσδιαφθείρω*." These are the exact words of the entire criticism. Comments are unnecessary. (15.) Philoct. 296: . . . *εἶτα πῦρ ἂν οὐ παρήν*, | *ἀλλ' ἐν πέτροισι πέτρον ἐκτρίβων μόλις* | *ἔφην' ἄφαντον φῶς*. Here it is proposed to read *εἰ μὴ 'ν* instead of *ἀλλ' ἐν* because "*εἶτα πῦρ ἂν οὐ παρήν* parait appeler au second vers la particule *εἰ*." But it is well known that instead of an unreal protasis, the opposite fact may be stated. The grammars cite prose examples, in which *δέ* happens to be used instead of *ἀλλά*. In Soph. Antig. 260 ff. there is an instance somewhat expanded, no distinct *ἀλλά*-clause occurring. In Eur. Elect. 1031 we read: . . . *οὐδ' ἂν ἔκτανον πόσων* | *ἀλλ' ἦλθ'* | *ἔχων μοι μαινάδ' ἐνθεον κόρην, κτέ.* As this is not a question of dialect, Homeric examples are not inapposite: E 22-3: *οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα μέλαιναν*, | *ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυστο σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλὴν ψας* (with which compare Δ 750-753, where *εἰ μὴ* is used). In the Odyssey, φ 128-9: *καὶ νῦν κε δὴ ρ' ἐτάνυσσε βίη τὸ τέταρτον ἀνέλικων*, | *ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀνένευε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἱεμένον περ*. See also η 278-280, ι 79-80, μ 71-2, ξ 32-4. It is true that in tragedy examples are rare, but in the present case there was a special reason for introducing *ἀλλά* instead of *εἰ μὴ*, as the sentence occurs at the end of a series of general logical conditions in past time, with frequentative *ἄν* in the apodosis, and it was desirable to mark the distinction. (16.) Philoct. 748: *πάταξον εἰς ἄκρον πόδα* is questioned, and *εἰ'* suggested because the use of *εἰς* with *πατάσσω* "est insolite." How many times ought it to occur, and what preposition ought to be used when we wish to speak of striking *into* something? (17.) In Philoct. 786: *παπαὶ μάλλ', ὦ ποῦς, οἶά μ' ἐργάσει κακά*, our emender proposes the fut. perf. *εἰργάσει*, which he prefers to Wecklein's *ἐργάζει*, because its sense is as appropriate and the form was more likely to be mistaken since it occurs nowhere else. But even if the MSS gave *εἰργάσει*, what would hinder any one from rejecting it as being "*insolite*"? It is a little curious, too, that the sentence "au lieu du futur *ἐργάζει* [sic], . . . W. a

¹ And the same thing is to be said of *ὁ λόγος σός*, which ought not to be emended into a text, despite *ὁ λυμεὼν ἐμός*. So. Ai. 573, and *ὁ γεννήτωρ ἐμός*. Eur. Hipp. 683, in both of which passages *ἐμός* is objective.
B. L. G.

proposé *ἐργάζει*” escaped the proof-reader, and the error was probably in the emender's manuscript. As a matter of fact, no emendation seems to be necessary, as the simple future in a mere exclamation is quite admissible under the circumstances. (18.) Philoct. 1293: for *ὥς* read *ῶ*.

2. Pp. 148-155. Notes on the *Asinaria* of Plautus, by L. Havet. Seven passages emended. One of these (5, 2, 43-60) is elaborately discussed and rearranged. The article is worthy of attention.

3. Pp. 154-5. Various notes. (1.) Aristotle (ed. Spengel), p. 118, I, 11: O. Riemann inserts *λέγοντος* after *ἀγαμέμνης*, and lower down condemns Spengel's cheap method of solving a difficulty by treating it as an “interpolation.” Before *ὁ λέγων* he rejects *ως* and the comma preceding it. (2.) Plaut. Capt. 3, 5, 36 emended by E. Benoist so as to read: Dum pereas, nihil interdico aiant vivere. (3.) Pacuv. Iliona v. 198, E. Benoist publishes the emendation of Guyet, ‘filium’ for ‘natum,’ and compares Plaut. Cistel. 2, 1, 48, where ‘natam’ must take the place of ‘filiam.’

4. Pp. 156-160. Book notices, by Tournier, Thurot, Weil, Riemann.

5. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 1-96: Germany begun.

No. 3. Aug.

1. Pp. 161-178. Biographical sketch of Charles Thurot (with portrait), by Émile Chatelain.

François-Charles-Eugène Thurot was born at Paris, Feb. 13, 1823, and died suddenly in that city, Jan. 17, 1882. Educated at Paris in the *Collège de Saint-Louis* and at the *École Normale supérieure*, he held positions successively (1844-7) in the colleges of Pau, Rheims, and Bordeaux. In 1848 he taught Pedagogy in the *École Normale*, and in 1849 went to Besançon as Professor of Rhetoric. In 1854 he was appointed Prof. of Ancient Literature at Clermont-Ferrand. It was here that he began to write on the works of Aristotle, for whom he had a peculiar veneration. His familiarity with that author has probably never been equalled in our times. In 1861 he became *Maître de Conférences* at the *École Normale*. His distinctive characteristic was that he carefully distinguished what he knew accurately from what he knew approximately or vaguely, and he taught only what he knew accurately. According to F. de Coulanges, “he knew the three [sic] classic languages as our best grammarians know one of them.” In 1869 appeared his great work: “Extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge.” In 1871 he was appointed to direct the study of Latin Philology at the *École des Hautes Études*, a position which suited him exactly. Here he guided his pupils in the critical study of many Latin works, paying much attention to the principles of textual criticism. In 1871 he entered the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, where his services were of a high value.

In addition to numerous works of his own (of which one of the most important is that on French Pronunciation, 1881), he prepared and published posthumous works of his father, François Thurot. Because of his minute knowledge of the middle ages, he was made a member of the council for the organization of the *École des Chartes*. His health first failed in 1877, when he had an attack of hemiplegia. He never regained his full strength. On the 17th of January, 1882, after a day's work, when retiring for the night, he died suddenly.

In 1880 Thurot had become an officer of the Legion of Honor and in 1876 a member of the Munich Academy of Sciences. He was distinguished as much for his kindness as a teacher and for the interest he took in his pupils, not only while under him, but also in their subsequent life, as he was for scholarship and literary activity. A complete list of his works including Review Articles would require eight or ten pages.

2. Pp. 179-185. On a Greek parchment of Egyptian origin, by H. Weil. This parchment, which is much injured, once formed a leaf in a *book* (not a mere roll, or file of leaves). It contains in a fragmentary state the second parabasis of the *Birds* of Aristophanes. As far as it is legible it agrees in the main with the oldest MSS. In v. 1078, where ζῶντ' ἀγάγη of the MSS has been changed to ζῶν τις ἀγάγη (ζῶν, acc. of ζῶς, attested only by grammarians), the parchment has ζῶντ' ἀπαγάγη, which is, no doubt, the true reading. (Cf. ἀπαγωγή.) Demosthenes (against Aristocrates, §30) cites a law which permits one to kill murderers or bring them before the magistrate: ἀποκτείνειν καὶ ἀπάγειν, and in his oration against Timocrates he uses the expression ἀποκτείνειν καὶ ἀπαγαγεῖν. So in the *Birds* we have (1077) ἦν ἀποκτείνῃ τις and (1078) ἦν δὲ ζῶντ' ἀπαγάγη. —In v. 1080, the word πᾶσι, which spoils the verse as it is in MSS, does not occur. —In v. 1069 there is evidence that in the parchment the word πάντα stood after δάκετα: a confirmation of Dissen's conjecture. The name of the principal person is Πεισθέταιρος according to the parchment. —Vv. 1063 ff., which are suspected, appear as in the MSS. The only variant is ἐφιζόμενα for ἐφεζόμενα. Weil proposes to divide the letters so as to read ἐφιζόμεν' ἃ καρπὸν ἀποβόσκειται, with ἀποβόσκονται understood in the clause introduced by οἱ. —V. 1119: ἀλλ' ὥς ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους, not ἀλλ' οὐκ as Dobree has proposed. — On πρηγορεῶνας (v. 1113) the scholiasts make comments in which πρόλογος is treated as a synonym of πρηγορεῶν. But in the best MSS of Aristophanes and also of Suidas, who reproduces these scholia, προλόγους is read instead of προλόβους. Now the parchment confirms this reading; for among some marginal notes occurs the following: ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΣ | ΗΤΩΝ ΟΡΝΙΘΩ | ΦΑΡΥΞ. If we examine closely the scholia just mentioned it will become evident that πρόλογος had this meaning. In the texts as at present punctuated we read: Πρηγορεῶνας: Δίδυμος τοὺς βρόγχους τῶν ὀρνέων, κυρίως τοὺς λεγομένους προλόβους, ὅτι σὺ λ λ έ γ ε τ α ι ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ σπτία. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων πρηγορεῶν πάλιν ὁ βρόγχος· ἐκάτερον δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προαθροίζειν ἐκεῖ τὴν τροφήν. The comma should be placed *after* κυρίως: and it is evident that προλόβους, i. e. προλόγους, is represented as being derived from πρό and λέγειν, and πρηγορεῶν (in the last clause) from πρό and ἀγείρειν. We must, therefore, assign πρόλογος a new meaning.

3. Pp. 185-7. On *Sed (diadema) attuleras domo, meditatum et cogitatum scelus* (Cic. Phil. II 34, 85), by J. Gantrelle. The remarks of G. on this passage, published in the *Revue de Philologie* V 1, having been unfavorably criticized by the *Blätter für das Bayer. Gymnasialwesen* (1882, No. 3), the author shows that the *Blätter* confounded two very different things: a noun in apposition with a whole clause without reference to its relation to other clauses, and a noun in apposition with part of a clause or a subordinate clause, and partaking of its construction. The examples cited from Cicero in the grammars belong to the latter category. He cites an example from Sallust (Letter of Mithr., ch. IV) similar to the one in question.

4. P. 187. On the quantity of e in 'tabe,' by L. Harant. Criticism of O. Riemann's emendation (*Rev. de Phil.* IV, p. 185) of the common reading of Liv. XXI 39, 2, in which he corrected 'illuvie tabeque' so as to remove the example of 'que' after ē. Harant maintains that e is *long* in 'tabe.'

5. Pp. 187-8. O. R. replies to the above (4), and claims that 'tabē' is the correct quantity everywhere with the single exception quoted by Harant: Lucr. I 806.

6. P. 188. L. Havet proposes to emend Quint. I 1, 30 by inserting 'bene notis' or something of the sort after 'ipsis syllabis.'

7. Pp. 189-192. Book notices, by E. C. and A. Fécamp.

8. *Revue des Revues*, pp. 97-224: Germany (finished), Austria, Belgium, Denmark, United States, France (begun).

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. X, Part II.

In pp. 113-121 of this part Cobet concludes his notes on Madvig's edition of Livy. On XLIII 13, 1, he writes: "in Codice est: *non sum nescius ab eadem negligentia, QUA nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri*. Pro QUA Madvig substituit QUIA. Nolle factum. *Negligentia est contemptus deorum, ὀλιγωρία καὶ περιφρόνησις τοῦ δαιμονίου*. Bona pars hominum Livii aetate aut nullos esse deos credebant aut eos non curare quid ageret humanum genus. Livius igitur *impietatem* hanc esse dicere non ausus est sed leniore vocabulo *negligentiam* appellavit. Queritur Livius *eadem* negligentia neque *nova* prodigia in publicum nuntiari, neque *vetera* in annales referri. Illorum temporum historici Polybii exemplo has superstitiosae aetatis nugas silentio praeteribant, Livius contra candidissimus mortalium bona fide credebant '*bovem foeminam locutam esse*.' Quid putemus Senatoribus animi futurum fuisse si quis istius modi prodigium in publicum nuntiasset?" On the dependence of Livy upon Polybius he writes: "Livy ubi ducem suum Polybium deserit in graves errores se implicare solet. Miscet diversa tempora et ordinem rerum gestarum perturbat." After illustrating this he proceeds: "in multo graviolem errorem Livius et semet ipsum et nos inducit in fingenda oratione, quam Astymedem in curia habuisse narrat. Toto coelo erat diversa ab ea oratione, quam re vera habuit. Astymedes, cui sua oratio satis placebat, scriptam eam in vulgus edidit. Polyb. XXX 4, ἐξέβαλε γὰρ ἔγγραπτον μετὰ ταῦτα ποιήσας τὴν σύνταξιν τῆς δικαιολογίας, ἣ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ἀναλαμβανόντων εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ἀτοπος ἐφαίνετο καὶ ἀπίθανος. Maiorem enim orationis partem consumsit criminando alios qui peius etiam de Romanis meriti tamen omnes veniam adepti essent. Polybius, qui ipsam orationem legerat, graviter Astymedem increpat. Livius, qui orationem non viderat (solent enim libelli huiusmodi cito interire) et Polybii immemor, longum et flebilem legati orationem de suo commentus est ad misericordiam Romanorum excitandam. Multa in ea oratione sunt pravi et vitiosi acuminis et supra modum exaggerata . . . Sed prorsus nihil horum in curia auditum est." At the end of the article Cobet notices some manifest imitations of Thucydides by Livy.

The next article (pp. 122-128) is by J. J. Hartman, entitled 'Euripidea.' He devotes his attention chiefly to the Iphigenia Aulidensis. In 521, for the

corrupt *κούδέν γ' ἀχρηστον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον παρόν*, he proposes: *ἀπόν γ' ἀχρηστον*, comparing Suppl. 867 and Hippol. 1001. In 1433 *καταδοκήσω σὴν ἐκεῖ παρουσίαν* he suggests *προθυμίαν*. On 447-9 he writes: "Agamemnon hominum de plebe felicitatem praedicans, his verbis utitur:

*καὶ γὰρ δακρῦσαι βραδίως αὐτοῖς ἔχει
ἀνολ.βά τ' εἰπεῖν, τῷ δὲ γενναίῳ φύσιν
ἅπαντα ταῦτα.*

Multum in his versibus sudarunt critici. Probatur plerumque Musgravii conjectura, qui verba *ἀνολ.βα* et *ἅπαντα* locum inter se mutare jussit. Sed vehementer vereor ne ea multum proficiamus; quid enim sit *ἀνολ.βα ταῦτα* equidem non assequor. Malim, ne una quidem litera mutata, pro *ταῦτα* legere *ταῦτά*; videtur enim *τῷ δὲ γενναίῳ φύσιν ἅπαντα ταῦτά* acerba breviloquentia dictum esse pro. viro nobili non licet ullos animi motus vultu vel voce prodere."

We have next, pp. 129-135, an article entitled *Observationes criticae in L. Annaei Senecae Dialogos et Epistolas*, by J. van der Vliet. On *ad Marc. de cons.* XI 4, he writes: "homo est corpus fragile et caducum 'precarii spiritus et male haerentis, *qua parum repentinum audiet et improvise sonus auribus gravis excutit.*' Est lectio sane corruptissima cod. A, ex qua Haasius haec effinxit: *qua partum repentinum auditus improvise sonus auribus gravis excutit.* Non opus est illius *partus repentinum* ineptiam multis verbis demonstrare. Etiamsi Latine ita scribi posset, de *feminis* tantum, neque de *homine* verum esset. Madvigius mirum in modum a solita prudentia et sagacitate aberrans, opem non a Deo ex machina, sed ab ipsa machina petivit. Scribit enim: *quem PETAURUM repentinum aut auditus ex improvise sonus auribus gravis excutit.* Addit explicandi causa: 'ea erat machina, quae subito exsurgens et sublata homines ostentabat periculosa arte se moventes, apte ad spectatorem ex inopinato percutiendum.' Suspicio ejusmodi machinam idem fuisse quod apud nostrates *κυβιστητήρες* et illi, qui quos ipsi vocant, ludos *Icarios* ludunt, appellare solent het zwevende rek, vel Gallice, le trapèze volant. Cuiuscunque modi illa machina fuerit, loco quoque nostro solita sua vice fungitur et lectorem ex inopinato percutit . . . Multo facilius et simplicius difficultas expediri posse videtur, si legerimus: *quem spectaculum repentinum aut auditus ex improvise sonus auribus gravis excutit.*"

In the next article, pp. 136-162, Naber continues his 'Euripidea.' On Hec. 246, *ὥστ' ἐνθανεῖν ἔγε σοῖς πέπλοις χεῖρ' ἐμήν*, he writes: "etiamsi fuerit tunc Ulysses *τεθνηκώς δειλία*, quam inaudita synecdoche est, si manum suam timore intermortuam dixerit, non se ipsum," and proposes to read *ἐμβαλεῖν*. In Hec. 836, *εἰ μοι γένοιτο φθόγγος ἐν βραχίσι καὶ χερσὶ καὶ ὀ μ α ι σ ι καὶ ποδῶν βάσει*, he proposes *κνήμιασι*. "κώμαισι ne Furiae quidem loqui possunt . . . Poterat Hecuba . . . manuum et pedum gesticulationibus fletum et animi dolorem significare." In Hec. 1155 he proposes *κάνδον Θρηκίον* for *κάμακα Θρηκίαν*. In his notes on the Phoenissae he says: "mihi quidem Phoenissae ex duabus traegediis contaminata fuisse videtur, ut Thebani belli quasi historia spectatorum oculis subiceretur. Non urgeo quidem fabulam praeter solitum esse longam, nam est hoc argumentum nimis lubricum, sed illud contendo, post pulcrum *τειχοσκοπίαν* in fabulae exordio et post vs. 751: *ὄνομα δ' ἐκάστου διατρύβη πολλὴ λέγειν*, quibus verbis Eteocles Euripideus ridet Aeschylī Septem . . . post hos

igitur versiculos contendo eundem poetam in eadem fabula longam nuntii ῥῆσιν inde a versu 1090, in qua septem ducum nomina et genus et insignia et fortia facta accurate describuntur, si ipse addiderit, inepte addidisse." On the Supplices he argues against Elmsley, who made out the chorus of fifteen by assuming that Jocasta was allowed two maids while each of the other six ladies had but one, that though Euripides often speaks of the seven leaders with their mothers, there were really only five present, as the corpses of Amphiaras and Polynices "neque afferri possunt neque afferuntur . . . ut quindecim choreutarum numerus expleatur, satis est credibile unamquamque matrem *binas* habuisse *θεραπαίνας*." In this article there are many interesting notes on these plays, and also on the Heraclidae and Hercules Furens.

Then follows an article (pp. 163-177) by van Herwerden on the Batrachomyomachia, the object of which is to show in opposition to Baumeister, who follows in the main the opinion of O. Müller, Bergk, and Bernhardt, that this poem cannot be attributed to Pígres the Carian, nearly a contemporary of the Persian war, but "esse pseudepigraphum et ante Alexandri Magni aetatem pangi neutiquam potuisse." In his examination he throws out of account the lines bracketed as spurious by the latest editor J. Draheim, and scrutinizes minutely the metre, the prosody, and the diction of the poem. On the employment of the metre he thinks "nihil concludi posse de aetate qua poeta vixerit . . . quod aetate Alexandrina externam illam, ut ita dicam, artem a multis felicissime cultam esse constat." But as to prosody "longe poeta noster discedit a veterum epicorum norma in frequenti brevium vocalium correptione ante mutam cum liquida, quam illi nisi parcius et plerumque in certis quibusdam vocabulis admittere solebant." But the question is fully settled by the diction. His conclusion is: "vix igitur ullum exstat in Graecis litteris opus quod tot et tam manifesta senioris originis gerit quasi fronte inscripta indicia quam Batrachomyomachia, quod carmen spero fore ut nemo posthac ad veterem poetam Graecum auctorem referat."

The next article (pp. 178-192) is by Cobet, and contains notes on Galen. He does not confine himself to passages which need correction, but cites many which are of interest on various accounts. "Saepe queritur Galenus corporum humanorum resecandi sibi copiam et facultatem non esse, quam ob rem simias et alias id genus bestias resecare satis habebat. Itaque operae pretium esse putavit narrare ea quae leguntur Tom. ii, p. 221: *θεασάμεθα δέ ποτε καὶ ληστοῦ σκελετὸν ἐν ὄρει κείμενον ὀλίγον ἐξωτέρω τῆς ὁδοῦ, ὃν ἀπέκτεινε μὲν τις ὁδοιπóρος ἐπεχειροῦντα πρότερον ὁμόσε χωρήσας, οὐκ ἔμελλε δὲ θάψειν οὐδεὶς τῶν οἰκηθόντων τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ μίσους ἐπέχαιρον ἐσθιομένῳ τῷ σώματι πρὸς τῶν ἰωνῶν, οἵτινες ἐν δυσὶν ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ καταφαγόντες τὰς σάρκας ἀπέλιπον ὥς εἰς διδασκαλίαν τῷ βουλευθέντι θεάσασθαι τὸν σκελετόν.*" "Admirabundus narrat Galenus Tom. iv, p. 361: *ἐναγχοῖς τις ἐν δακτυλίῳ Φαέθοντα διέγλυψεν ἐπὶ τεσσάρων ἵππων ὀχοῦμενον, ὃν ἐκάστου καὶ χαλινοὶ καὶ στόματα καὶ οἱ πρόσθιοι τῶν ὀδόντων καὶ ποδῶν ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδ' ἐωρώντο τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπὸ μικρότης οἱ μὲν περιστρέψαιμι τὸ θέαμα πρὸς αὐγὴν λαμπράν.* Myrmecides et Callicrates τέθριππα ἐποίησαν ὑπὸ μίας καλνπτόμενα teste Aeliano V. H. i 17, ubi interpretes et alia attulerunt et Plinium H. N. xxxvi 4, 15: Myrmecides, cuius quadrigam cum agitatore cooperuit alis musca." A passage is quoted (Tom. v, p. 655) on the subject of Stichometry, from which it appears that "τοὺς στίχους sive τὰ ἐπη *totidem constare syllabis, quot versus hexametri conti-*

nent . . . et non litteras sed syllabas numerari solere." "Lepidum proverbium ex aliquo comico poeta sumtum solus nobis servavit Galenus Tom. v, p. 878: πρὸς πάντων σχεδὸν ἀνθρώπων ἄδεται· παχέα γαστήρ λεπτὸν οὐ τίκειται νόον."¹

The next article (pp. 193-210) is also by Cobet on Bekker's edition (1849) of Dio Cassius. A considerable number of the corrections proposed here are found already in the Teubner edition, Dindorf, 1863. But the whole paper is full of interest. "Dio Cass. 38, 17. Cicero τρισχίλιους καὶ ἑπτακοσίους καὶ πενήκοντα σταδίους ὑπὲρ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐξωρίσθη. Vertunt: '*ultra 468 millia.*' Mirificus sane numerus, sed quia Dioni ubique *mille passus* non sunt *octo stadia* sed *septem cum semisse* vertendum est *ultra quingentesimum lapidem* (500 × 7½ = 3750). Cicero ad Atticum III 4, in *rogatione de perniciē mea quod correctum esse audieramus erat eiusmodi ut mihi ultra quadringenta millia liceret esse quum in priore rogatione ultra quingentesimum lapidem esset scriptum*. Sic Dio pro *intra mille passus* dicere solet μέχρι ὀγδόου ἡμισταδίου et ἐντὸς ὀγδόου ἡμισταδίου Lib. 54, 6, et pro *ultra centesimum ab Urbe lapidem* dixit Lib. 46, 44, 4, ὑπὲρ πενήκοντα καὶ ἑπτακοσίους σταδίους ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως." "Quam facile historiae fides mendaciis et absurdis commentis corrumpi possit ostendit locus Dionis Cassii 45, 1, 2, de Atia, matre Augusti: ἡ Ἀτία, inquit, ΔΕΙΝΩΣ ΊΣΤΥΡΙΖΕΤΟ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος αὐτὸν (*Augustum*) κεκηκέναι ὅτι καταδαρβοῦσά ποτε ἐν ναφ αὐτοῦ δράκοντί τινι μίγνυσθαι ἔΝΟΜΙΣΕΝ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῷ ἱκνουμένῳ χρόνῳ ἔτεκεν. Quis ad haec non firmiter credat ipsam Atiam sanctam matronam hoc absurdum commentum diserto suo testimonio confirmasse? Tamen nihil est minus verum et numquam Atia quidquam de his nugis inaudivit, nedum ipsa narravit. Dio in his omnibus nil nisi Suetonium Graece vertit idque satis negligenter. Suetonius in *Augusto* haec scripsit: '*in Asclepiadis Mendesii θεολογουμένου libri lego Atiam cum ad solemne Apollinis sacrum media nocte venisset posita in templo lectica OBDORMIVISSE draconemque repente irrepsisse ad eam pauloque post egressum illamque EXPERGEFACTAM quasi a concubitu mariti purificasse se, . . . Augustum natum mense decimo et ob hoc Apollinis filium existimatum.*' Optime Casaubonus ad h. l. '*oportet hominem (Asclepiadem) fuisse nugatorem magnum et, quod de Timaeo olim dictum, γρασοῦλλέκτριαν ineptum qui ausus sit, fortasse solus, de Augusti conceptu fabulam anilem ut rem veram memoriae tradere.*' Quid igitur Dione facias qui de impostore Aegypto verbum unum non facit, sed ipsam Atiam inducit deinῶς ἰσχυριζομένην haec ita facta esse?"

The last article also in this number (pp. 211-224) is furnished by Cobet, ad *Appianum de bellis civilibus*. Room can be found for only a single extract. "Lib. iii 16, 41: Μάρκος μὲν . . . ἀνῆρέθη· ἀνδροφόνους δὲ ἐκφεύγειν Ὑπερείδες, et post pauca: Δέκμον τὴν ἐγγὺς Κελτικὴν ὙΠΕΡΟΡᾶτε ἔχοντα. In omnibus libris ὑπερορᾶν et περιορᾶν confundi solent. Non est tamen difficile distinguere, nam ὑπερορᾶν est *despicere, contemnere*, περιορᾶν autem *sinere pati*. Itaque restituendum ἐκφεύγειν ΠΕΡΕΪδες *elabi passus es*, et ΠΕΡΙΟΡᾶτε *ἐχοντα habere sinitis*. Apud veteres (praeter Thucydidem [et Herodotum]) περιορᾶν constanter cum participio componitur: apud sequiores promiscue cum participio aut infinitivo."

C. D. MORRIS.

¹ See Apostol. V 22a (Corpus Paroem. Graec. II 337) where von Leutsch has cited a number of sources. 'Senarius,' he adds, 'a poeta tragico profectus videtur, quum inter praeclara tragodiae antiquae praecepta collocatus apud Gregorium Naz. carm. iamb. 18, 588, inveniat. The verse has been a stock quotation for many years in the editions of Persius I, 57. B. L. G.